



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,811	04/21/2004	Maircad Lyons	21513/5	7263
7590 Brian L. Michaelis Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP One Financial Center Boston, MA 02111			EXAMINER LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/828,811

Applicant(s)

LYONS ET AL.

Examiner

Kimberly Lovel

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 152). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 14 September 2007.
2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the current application. In the amendment filed 14 September 2007, claims 18-21 were added. This action is made Final.
3. The rejections of claims 1-7 and 10-13 and 15-17 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al and claims 8, 9 and 14 as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al in view of US Patent No 6,633,878 to Underwood have been maintained and the rejections of claims 18-21 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-7 and 10-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al (hereafter Matson) in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al (hereafter Moss).**

Referring to claim 1, Matson discloses a system for processing incoming data and inserting said incoming data into a database, comprising:

an incoming data receiving component [IM 107], to connect to a source of data [sources 101, 103 and 105] and receive incoming data (see [0031]);

a parsing component [process 211] communicating with said incoming data receiving component, to receive and parse said incoming data as a function of a plurality of fields [supplier name, supplier product number, etc] (see [0037]);

a loader component, in communication with said parsing component, to receive parsed data from said parsing component, and to sort said parsed data [stores in XML file 215] (see [0039], lines 1-3) as a function of said plurality of fields (see [0037]);

a data sorting component [data load technician] to re-sort said sorted data into a plurality of tables [files] in said database [database 111] (see [0059]-[0060]).

However, Matson fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables. Moss discloses the insertion of transactional data into a database, including the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging tables] (se [0465]) in order to increases efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to load the XML file data of Matson into the staging tables as disclosed by Moss. One would have been motivated to do so.in order to increases efficiency by

avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand (Matson: see [0035], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Matson and Moss (hereafter Matson/Moss) discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said loader component processes said parsed data into a proper format [XML] for insertion into said database [database 111] (Matson: see [0036]-[0037], lines 1-3); stores said parsed data in a file [supplier XML file 215] (see [0039], lines 3-8); said loader component being further configured to deactivate access to a temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]); loading said file into said temporary table in said database (Moss: see [0465]); and thereafter re-activate access to said temporary table (Moss: see [0465]).

Referring to claim 3, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said data sorting component also inserts relational link information in said plurality of tables in said database [loading relational data into database 111] (Matson: see [0035], lines 7-10).

Referring to claim 4, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said data sorting component, upon accessing a data item in said temporary tables that indicates an error, moves said data item into a corresponding error table [faulty products data file] (see Matson [0043]).

Referring to claim 5, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 1 wherein:

said parsing component includes a generic parsing component having common functionality to parse data (Matson: see [0037]); and

wherein at least one specific function is implemented into a specific parsing component which encapsulates said generic parsing component, said at least one specific function modifying functionality of said generic parsing component so that said specific parsing component can parse data in a specific format (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 6, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 5 wherein said at least one specific function overrides corresponding functionality in said generic parsing component (Matson: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 7, Matson/Moss discloses the system of claim 1 wherein said data sorting component processes data in terms of one of: transaction data [product transactions] (Matson: see [0023]), line item data, additional data, enhanced data, trip leg data, and card balance data.

Referring to claims 10-13 and 15-17, the claims are rejected respectively on the same grounds as claims 1-7.

5. Claims 8, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al as applied respectively to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of US Patent No 6,633,878 to Underwood (hereafter Underwood).

Referring to claim 8, Matson/Moss discloses transactions, however, Matson/Moss fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card. Underwood discloses initializing an ecommerce database framework, including the further limitation wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card (see column 107, lines 56-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the feature of Underwood wherein commercial credit cards represent the transactions with the system of Matson/Moss. One would have been motivated to do so since Matson/Moss handles data received from real-time data feeds (Matson: see [0023], lines 3-7).

Referring to claim 9, the combination of Matson/Moss and Underwood discloses the system of claim 8 wherein said data sorting component includes additional information in said data tables regarding tax information for said transactional data (Underwood: see column 116, lines 7-17).

Referring to claim 14, Matson/Moss discloses transactions, however, Matson/Moss fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said data is credit card transaction data. Underwood discloses initializing an ecommerce database

Art Unit: 2167

framework, including the further limitation said data is credit card transaction data (see column 107, lines 56-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the feature of Underwood wherein commercial credit cards represent the transactions with the method of Matson/Moss. One would have been motivated to do so since Matson/Moss handles data received from real-time data feeds (Matson: see [0023], lines 3-7).

6. Claims 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al in view of US Patent 7,181,417 to Langseth et al (hereafter Langseth).

Referring to claim 18, Matson discloses a system for processing incoming data and inserting said incoming data into a database, comprising:

an incoming data receiving component [IM 107], to connect to a source of data [sources 101, 103 and 105] and receive incoming data (see [0031]);

a parsing component [process 211] communicating with said incoming data receiving component, to receive and parse said incoming data as a function of a plurality of fields [supplier name, supplier product number, etc] (see [0037]);

a loader component, in communication with said parsing component, to receive parsed data from said parsing component, and to sort said parsed data [stores in XML file 215] (see [0039], lines 1-3) as a function of said plurality of fields (see [0037]);

a data sorting component [data load technician] to re-sort said sorted data into a plurality of tables [files] in said database [database 111] (see [0059]-[0060]).

However, Matson fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables. Moss discloses the insertion of transactional data into a database, including the further limitation of sorting the parsed data into a plurality of temporary tables [staging tables] (se [0465]) in order to increases efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to load the XML file data of Matson into the staging tables as disclosed by Moss. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by avoiding feeding data into a data import process without having a thorough understanding of data beforehand (Matson: see [0035], lines 10-12).

Matson/Moss fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the loader component sorting the parsed data in to a plurality of tables ***according to programmed SQL queries***. Langseth discloses loading parsed data into a temporary database, including the further limitation of loading the data according to programmed SQL queries [pre-tested SQL scripts] (see column 17, lines 21-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the pre-tested scripts of Langseth to load the data into the database of Matson/Moss. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase the

accuracy and efficiency of sorting the data by utilizing pre-tested scripts that are known to be accurate.

Referring to claim 20, the combination of Matson/Moss and Langseth (hereafter Matson/Moss/Langseth) discloses the system of claim 18 wherein said re-sorting comprises invoice transaction processing and card balance processing (Langseth: see column 15, line 36 – column 16, line 6).

Referring to claim 21, Matson/Moss/Langseth discloses the system of claim 20 wherein each of said transaction processing and said card balancing processing uses separate SQL statements to retrieve data from said temporary tables [there are multiple pre-tested scripts] (Langseth: see column 17, lines 21-29).

7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0186821 to Matson et al in view of US PGPub 2005/0160014 to Moss et al in view of US Patent 7,181,417 to Langseth et al as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of US Patent No 6,633,878 to Underwood.

Referring to claim 19, Matson/Moss/Langseth discloses transactions, however, Matson/Moss/Langseth fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card. Underwood discloses initializing an ecommerce database framework, including the further limitation wherein said data is transactional data representing transactions completed using a commercial credit card (see column 107, lines 56-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the feature of Underwood wherein commercial credit cards represent the transactions with the system of Matson/Moss/Langseth. One would have been motivated to do so since Matson/Moss/Langseth handles data received from real-time data feeds (Matson: see [0023], lines 3-7).

Response to Arguments

8. The rejections in the Office Action were based on Matson/Moss.
9. Applicant's arguments filed 14 September 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
10. Referring to applicant's arguments on pages 7-8 of the Remarks, applicant argues: Applicants respectfully submit that here, Matson simply discloses string the parsed XML data without any further sorting at all, no less, sorting the parsed data into temporary tables as a function of said plurality of fields as particularly claimed.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that Moss is utilized to teach the concept of the temporary tables. Matson is utilized to teach the concept of parsing the data as a function of a plurality of fields. Matson ([0037], lines 15-18) states "This means that every "field" that the supplier supplies/identifies as part of the dataset will be parsed from the input file and stored as separate elements in the supplier XML file." Separating the fields is considered to represent sorting the parsed data.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2167

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

20 November 2007
kml


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2167